APPEAL TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

To: Helsinki Administrative Court

Appellant: E.F. Fluff

00180 Helsinki

+----

Respondent: Helsinki Police Department

Decision Appealed: Decision of 8 April 2026, **5500/R/49056/25**, by Detective Jenni Wilkko, suspending pre-trial investigation into incited harassment, minor assault, and defamation.

I refer to **Exhibit-K-C-14 WilkEFF 5500-R-49056-25**

1. The Decision Appealed

On 8 April 2026, Detective Jenni Wilkko issued a decision suspending the pre-trial investigation into my report of incited harassment, minor assault, and defamation of me by my ex-partner Anna Vuorivirta via a woman known to me as "Terhi," with the stated reason that I had not been able to provide sufficient identifying information and is a falsification of public record.

The decision states:

"Ef Fluff on ilmoittanut, että Terhi-niminen nainen on töninyt häntä ravintolassa. Fluff ei ole kyennyt kertomaan epäillystä muita tietoja. Asiassa ei ole saatu rikoksesta epäillyn henkilöllisyydestä riittävää selvitystä, eikä tällaista epäillyn henkilöllisyyden selviämiseen johtavaa selvitystä ole saatavissa asian laatu huomioiden tavanomaisin ja tarkoituksenmukaisin menetelmin."

(Translation: "Ef Fluff has reported that a woman named Terhi pushed them in a restaurant. Fluff has not been able to provide other information about the suspect. In the case, sufficient information about the identity of the suspect has not been obtained, and such information leading to the identification of the suspect is not available by ordinary and appropriate methods considering the nature of the case."

The decision fails entirely to address the central fact of the matter: Terhi is not a random assailant or street nutcase. Terhi is acting on behalf of my abusive ex-partner Anna Vuorivirta. Audio and video evidence shows Terhi explicitly repeating defamation supplied by Vuorivirta. This is not an isolated assault.

It is part of a continuing pattern of incited harassment orchestrated by Vuorivirta, documented extensively in the rejoinder to MIGRI (Administrative Court 948302026) and in multiple exhibits before this Court. The police's claimed inability to identify Terhi is therefore bad faith deliberately neglectful policing — they could identify her through Vuorivirta, through her street address, through the video and audio, or through basic investigative steps they chose not to take.

This is worsened by the fact that Terhi has been informing people local to the area that Anna Vuorivirta destroyed my Irish legal papers, Irish Court submissions, Irish Court Evidence, hand-written Irish medical records. The core of a long running dispute and part of a human trafficking complaint against Anna Vuorivirta. This is directly contrary to false statements made by Anna

Vuorivirta to three different Courts in the Helsinki District Court, the Court of Appeal, statements to Pasila Police, and MIGRI. Statements have, as the situation has suited Anna Vuorivirta changed from *"I returned the documents"* she did not. *"They don't exist"*. They do. *"They're fake false instruments"*. They're not. *"Fluff can just replace them"*. I cannot, hand written medical records cannot be replaced. Court evidence cannot be replaced.

2. Factual Basis of the Appeal

2.1 I Provided Extensive Identifying Information and offered more:

Contrary to the police decision, I provided exhaustive identifying information about "Terhi" in my original complaint and in subsequent communications and I stated there was more:

- Her first name: **Terhi**
- Her physical description: blonde-brown hair, black leather bag with silver studs, purple velvet tracksuit, black coat
- Her association with **Anna Vuorivirta**, a person known to the police through multiple complaints. The evidence shows that Terhi was not acting independently. Terhi explicitly states in the audio recordings that the defamation comes from Anna Vuorivirta. Terhi's harassment is part of a continuing pattern of incited abuse orchestrated by my abusive ex-partner Anna Vuorivirta, documented extensively in the rejoinder to MIGRI (Administrative Court 948302026) and in multiple exhibits before this Court. Terhi is Vuorivirta's school friend and proxy.
- **Video recordings** of the harassment (links to YouTube provided)
- **Audio recordings** where Terhi explicitly states the defamation comes from Anna Vuorivirta
- **The street where she resides Eerikinkatu, just up from Pueblo Mexican Restaurant.**
- **Locations she is known to frequent**, including Eerikin Kulma (Eerikinkatu 28, Helsinki), Boot Hill Pub, and other establishments in the area.
- Her **school friend relationship** to Anna Vuorivirta (documented in Exhibits)

2.2 The Police refused to Conduct a Proper Investigation

The police made no apparent attempt to:

- Interview Anna Vuorivirta, who is directly implicated in the incitement
- Interview witnesses present at Eerikin Kulma (bouncers, bar staff, other patrons)
- Review the video and audio evidence I provided
- Contact me for additional information, despite my explicit request for guidance on uploading evidence
- Conduct basic investigative steps that would identify "Terhi" through known associates, social circles, or public records

- I refer to:
    - **Exhibit-K-C-1 WilkEFF 21062024 Anna Friend Terhi.m4a**
    - **El Exhibit-K-C-2 WilkEFF_Ongoing harassment by Anna Vuo...friend Terhi-Ongoing defamation by Anna Vuorivirta.mp4**
    - **Exhibit-K-C-3 WilkEFF 04.05.2025 TERHI 5 INCITED HARASSMENT ACTUAL VIDEO.mp4**
    - **Exhibit-K-C-4 WilkEFF 29.12.2024 Teri 3 Incited Harassment 3 Anna's friend Terhi again at the bar unprovoked.m4a**
    - **Exhibit-K-C-5 WilkEFF 21.06.2024 Terhi 2 Incited Harassment Anna Friend Terhi.m4a**
    - **Exhibit-K-C-6 WilkEFF 09.03.2024 Terhi 1 incited harassment 1 Anna's friend harassment me on 9th of March.pdf**

It is impossible that the police cannot identify Terhi. Given the identifying information provided — address, known locations, video, audio, and association with Anna Vuorivirta — it is impossible that the police cannot identify Terhi. It is also simply impossible that they cannot identify that Anna Vuorivirta was involved given that Pasila Police were given SMS WITH Anna Vuorivirta. It evidences ongoing discriminatory misconduct related to me. For Jenni Wilkko to falsely claim I did not provide identifying evidence is a falsification of public record, defamation, and a crime.

2.3 The Closure is Incompatible with the Pre-Trial Investigation Act

Under Chapter 3, Section 13 of the Pre-Trial Investigation Act (805/2011), a pre-trial investigation may be suspended if there is no suspect and no clarifying evidence is available.

This condition was not met.

The threshold for "syyta epäillä" (reason to suspect) is intentionally low. When a person reports a crime and provides identifying information, video evidence, audio evidence, and witness information, the obligation to investigate is triggered.

The police's claimed inability to identify "Terhi" is not credible given:

- I provided her home street address
- I provided her known locations
- She is publicly associated with Anna Vuorivirta, who is known to the police
- Identifying Video and audio evidence exists

3. Legal Grounds for the Appeal

3.1 Violation of the Pre-Trial Investigation Act (805/2011), Chapter 3, Section 13

The suspension of the investigation was unlawful because:

- The condition "no suspect" was not met — I named "Terhi" and provided sufficient identifying information

- The condition "no clarifying evidence available" was not met — video, audio, places of Terhi frequents, named associates, and address information were provided

3.2 Violation of the Police Act (872/2011), Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5

The police violated their statutory duties:

- **Section 1**: Duty to prevent and investigate crimes
- **Section 2**: Duty to respect fundamental and human rights
- **Section 3**: Principle of proportionality
- **Section 4**: Principle of minimum harm
- **Section 5**: Principle of purpose-linkage

By closing the investigation without meaningful inquiry, the police failed to investigate a crime and discriminated against a vulnerable disabled person.

I refer to Exhibit-K-C-15 WilkEFF B-lausunto, B-certificate 2026

3.3 Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (434/2003), Sections 7 and 45

- **Section 7**: Duty to act impartially and exercise authority appropriately
- **Section 45**: Duty to provide a reasoned decision

The decision's stated reason — "Fluff has not been able to provide other information" — is demonstrably false. I provided exhaustive information. The decision is therefore not reasoned in good faith.

3.4 Violation of the Constitution of Finland, Sections 21 and 22

- **Section 21**: Right to have a case dealt with appropriately and without undue delay
- **Section 22**: Duty of public authorities to guarantee fundamental and human rights

3.5 Violation of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47

Right to an effective remedy and a fair trial.

3.6 Violation of the EU Victims' Rights Directive (2012/29/EU)

Right to be heard and to have individual needs assessed.

4. The Discriminatory and Bad Faith Nature of the Closure

4.1 Pattern of Institutional Failure

This is part of a continuing pattern of Institutional Abuse, deliberate police neglect and discriminatory policing and the denial of protection, documented extensively in:

- Exhibit-K-C-12 WilkEFF Administrative Court 948302026 customer number 2092313 REJOINDER EF Fluff
- Exhibit-K-C-11 WilkEFF EF Fluff Administrative Complaint Poliisi Anssi Enqvist

- Exhibit-K-C-13 (Full audio of malicious wellness check)

4.2 Bad Faith Indicators

i. **The police claim "cannot identify her"** despite having her address, photo, video, audio, and known locations. If Jenni Wilkko wishes to place that on the permanent public record then she can remove the lie and falsified public record of my inability to provide evidence and replace it with a statement regarding her own incompetence and inability to do basic police work.

ii. **The police claim "no evidence"** despite being provided with video and audio

iii. **The police claim "Fluff has not been able to provide other information"** despite exhaustive provision of information. See i.

iv. **This is a pattern** — the same "no evidence" and "cannot identify" responses have been used repeatedly in my complaints (documented in Exhibits)

v. **Refusal to interview** — I have never been interviewed for this. Not once. I have not been interviewed for any complaint that Pasila Police have closed. This is not an oversight. It is a pattern. The police make decisions about my complaints without ever hearing my account. They then claim 'no evidence' or 'cannot identify,' using their own failure to investigate as the justification for closing the investigation

4.3 **The Context of Abuse**

The harassment by Terhi is incited by my abusive ex-partner Anna Vuorivirta as part of a continuing pattern of coercive control and human trafficking abuse documented in:

- Exhibit-K-C-8 WilkEFFANNA ABUSE LAWYER MAIN — detailing coercive control, fraud, perjury, and deliberate manipulation
- Exhibit-K-C-9 WilkEFF (Anna V Artificical Situation) — documenting Anna's expertise in trauma and her deliberate exploitation of my vulnerabilities
- Exhibit-K-C-10 WilkEFF Roosa Sainio Police complaint — a human trafficking complaint filed by a Finnish national
- The rejoinder to MIGRI (Administrative Court 948302026), which documents the full scope of the abuse — Exhibit-K-C-12 WilkEFF Administrative Court 948302026 customer number 2092313 REJOINDER EF Fluff

The police's refusal to investigate Terhi, while simultaneously relying on Vuorivirta's false statements, is an institutional amplification of her abuse.

5. Relief Sought

I ask the Administrative Court to:

1. **Quash** the police decision of 8 April 2026, 5500/R/49056/25, suspending the pre-trial investigation into incited harassment, minor assault, and defamation.

2. **Order** the Helsinki Police Department to reopen the investigation and conduct a proper pre-trial investigation, including:
    - Interviewing me as a victim
    - Interviewing witnesses (bouncers at Eerikin Kulma, other patrons)
    - Reviewing all video and audio evidence
    - Identifying and interviewing "Terhi"
    - Interviewing Anna Vuorivirta as the person who incited the harassment
3. **Declare** that the police's failure to investigate, despite the provision of exhaustive identifying information, constitutes a violation of:
    - The Pre-Trial Investigation Act (805/2011), Chapter 3, Section 13
    - The Police Act (872/2011), Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5
    - The Administrative Procedure Act (434/2003), Sections 7 and 45
    - The Constitution of Finland, Sections 21 and 22
    - The EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47
    - The EU Victims' Rights Directive (2012/29/EU)
4. **Refer** the conduct of Detective Jenni Wilkko and the handling of this matter to the National Police Board (Poliisihallitus) for administrative review.
5. **Order** reimbursement of my legal costs, and grant a full waiver of the court fees.

6. Request for Waiver of Court Fees

6.1 Grounds for the Request

I am a disabled person without income. My financial situation is as follows:

- I am homeless, currently in exile in France
- I have no access to my medication
- I have been subjected to financial abuse and debt bondage by Anna Vuorivirta
- My disability welfare has been disrupted
- I am unable to pay the court fees

6.2 Legal Basis

Under the Act on Court Fees (Tuomioistuinmaksulaki), the court may waive or reduce the fee if the appellant is unable to pay due to financial hardship. I am completely impecunious due to Vuorivirta's human trafficking abuse and the Institutional neglect and abuse by Pasila Police.

I am disabled. I have a valid Finnish B Certificate.

7. Conclusion

The decision to suspend the investigation into the incited harassment by "Terhi" was unlawful, discriminatory, and taken in bad faith. I provided exhaustive identifying information, including video and audio evidence. The police made no meaningful effort to investigate.

This is not an isolated incident but part of a continuing pattern of institutional failure documented across multiple complaints and administrative proceedings.

I request that the Administrative Court:

1. Quash the decision
2. Order the police to reopen and properly investigate
3. Declare the decision incompatible with Finnish and EU law
4. Refer Detective Jenni Wilkko for administrative investigation and sanction.
5. Refer the matter to the Non-Discrimination Ombudsman for additional review.
6. Grant legal aid remuneration for legal work I have been forced to do due to ongoing denial of rights related to these matters.
7. Grant a waiver of court fees

Note:

Please provide an email response link so I can upload the files too large to attach with email.

E.F. Fluff